UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,394	06/20/2003	Ranjan K. Sen	30835/303495	8526

45373 7590 07/02/2007	EXAMINER
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP (MICROSOFT)	SWEARINGEN, JEFFREY R
233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE	
6300 SEARS TOWER	
CHICAGO, IL 60606	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2145	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 April 2007</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>14-18,21 and 22</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-13,19 and 20</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>20 June 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1.   Claims 14-18 and 21-22 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as

being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was

made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 4/4/2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for

the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
> another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
> granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
> applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
> 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
> only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
> of such treaty in the English language.

3.   Claims 1-13 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chu et al.

(US 6,718,376 B1).

4.   In regard to claims 1 and 19-20, Chu disclosed:

> *maintaining a dynamic service consistency file containing entries to identify predefined*
>
> *service components that are currently available in the computer system, wherein the currently*
>
> *available predefined service component entries are linked according to their dependency;*
>
> column 7, lines 16-67
>
> *comparing the dynamic service consistency file to a reference file containing entries to*
>
> *identify the predefined service components in the computer system, wherein the predefined*
>
> *service component entries are linked in the reference file according to their dependency;* column
>
> 6, lines 5-28
>
> *determining whether an inconsistency exists between service component entries within*
>
> *the dynamic service consistency file and the reference file; and* column 6, lines 5-28

starting any lost predefined service component to correct any inconsistency based upon the determining step. Column 6, lines 5-28

Chu detects whether a service that normally is operational has failed – an inconsistency. The detection of services that are operational and services that should be operational are inherently maintained in "files".

5.   In regard to claim 2, Chu disclosed:

modifying the dynamic service consistency file based upon the starting step; and column 7, lines 31-59

repeating from the maintaining step. Column 7, lines 31-59

6.   In regard to claim 3, Chu disclosed:

reading the reference file; column 7, lines 1-15

identifying the dependency services of the lost predefined service component according to the reference file; and column 7, lines 1-15

generating a log message to report the lost predefined service component including the identified dependency service components based upon the identifying step. Column 7, lines 1-15

7.   In regard to claim 4, Chu disclosed:

saving the log message. Column 7, lines 1-15

8.   In regard to claim 5, Chu disclosed:

reading the reference file; column 7, lines 1-15

identifying the dependency services of the lost predefined service component according to the reference file; column 7, lines 1-15

determining whether the lost predefined service component has been successfully started; column 7, lines 1-15

generating a log message to report the lost predefined service component according to the determination step, wherein the log message includes dependency service information of the lost predefined service component. Column 7, lines 1-15

9.   In regard to claim 6, Chu disclosed:

generating an alert message to report the lost predefined service according to the

determination step; and column 7, lines 1-15

sending the alert message to a user. Column 7, lines 1-15

10.   In regard to claim 7, Chu disclosed:

identifying the currently available predefined service components; and column 8, lines

24-48

generating the dynamic service consistency file based upon the identifying step. Column

8, lines 24-48

11.   In regard to claim 8, Chu disclosed:

determining whether a timeout has occurred; and column 7, lines 1-15

repeating the identifying step when a timeout has occurred based upon the determination

step. Column 7, lines 1-15

12.   In regard to claim 9, Chu disclosed:

inconsistency is based on at least one missing predefined service component in the

dynamic service consistency file when compared to the reference file. Column 6, lines 5-28

13.   In regard to claim 10, Chu disclosed:

the service components include any one from the group of a process, a service hosting

process, a service, a provider service, and a dependency service. Column 6, lines 5-28

14.   In regard to claim 11, Chu disclosed:

the predefined service components are installed service hosting processes or provider

services that are depended upon by other services. Column 6, lines 5-28

15.   In regard to claim 12, Chu disclosed:

the reference file is represented in any one from the group of a tree, a graph, a linked list,

or a table. Column 6, lines 5-28

16.   In regard to claim 13, Chu disclosed:

the dynamic service consistency file is represented in any one from the group of a tree, a

graph, a linked list, or a table. Column 6, lines 5-28

Conclusion

17.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Mann et al.   US 6,654,801 B2

Undercoffer, Jeffrey et al. "A Secure Infrastructure for Service Discovery and Access in Pervasive Computing." Mobile Networks and Applications. Vol 8, Issue 2. pp 113-25. April 2003. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Hodes, Todd et al. "An Architecture for Secure Wide-Area Service Discovery." Wireless Networks. Vol 8, issue 2/3. March 2002. pp 213-30. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Ko, In-Young et al. "Dynamic Coordination of Information Management Services for Processing Dynamic Web Content." Proceedings of the 11th international conference on World Wide Web WWW'02. ACM Press. May 2002. 355-65.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey R. Swearingen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3921. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on 571-272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jason Cardone
Supervisory Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2145

JRS